

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/839,037	Applicant(s) NAISH ET AL.	
	Examiner Joseph A. Fischetti	Art Unit 3627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph A. Fischetti. (3) _____.

(2) Atty. Amrozowicz. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 September 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: none.

Identification of prior art discussed: contents of IDS dated 5/10/2002.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Aplicant's representative faxed response (as attched) already filed but not yet entered to advance application to issue.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Sep. 28. 2006 10:50AM INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ PC
Sep. 25. 2006 1:31PM INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ PC

No. 3158 P. 2/3
No. 3315 P. 2

Appl. No. 09/839,037
Reply to Communication of July 28, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 25 2006 UTILITY PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Vicki NAISH et al. Group Art Unit: 3627
Serial No.: 09/839,037 Examiner: J. A. Fischetti
Filed: April 19, 2001 Confirmation No.: 3621
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR CUSTOMER STOREFRONT
OPERATIONS
Docket No.: H0002193.33654
Customer No.: 000128

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

on 9/25/06 . Signature: Paul D. Amosowicz

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.105

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants are in receipt of a request for information pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.105. Specifically, the Examiner has requested that Applicants provide publication dates for two documents cited in an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS), and mailed to the USPTO on April 30, 2001. These two documents were cited on the filed PTO-1449 as "Intalogik Limited Online Tracking System (7 pages), Internet printout," and "Intalogik.com, screen captures of Website, Customs Invoice (49) pages," but did not include publication dates.

Sep. 28. 2006 10:50AM INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ PC
Sep. 22. 2006 1:31PM INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ PC

No. 3158 No. 3315 P. 3
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Appl. No. 09/839,037

Reply to Communication of July 28, 2006

SEP 25 2006

Applicants have dutifully attempted to determine publication dates for these documents, but have been unable to do so. Applicants note that it is their understanding that Intalogik Limited (Intalogik) was originally incorporated in the United Kingdom in 1996 as a joint venture between Honeywell, the assignee of the instant application, and Air Ground Equipment Sales (AGES). Intalogik then became wholly owned by Honeywell on January 1, 2000, and was subsequently divested on March 31, 2003. As far as Applicants can readily determine, none of the Intalogik staff remains with Honeywell, nor can they readily determine whether the documents any longer exist, let alone the accurate publication dates thereof.

It is Applicants belief that the above-noted documents were likely published some time between 1996 and 2000, and thus readily admit that the subject documentation qualifies as prior art to the instant invention. Nonetheless, Applicants do not understand that either document discloses or suggests, either alone or in combination with any other art of record, the subject matter of the instant invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants state that they do not know, and cannot readily obtain, the requested publication dates, and thus submit that this response to the Examiner's request is acceptable.

Applicants further submit that the present application continues to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

By:

Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060

Dated: Sep. 25, 2006